

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318433196>

Life and Works of Dattatreya Narayan Dhanagare: An Introductory Account

Article in *Sociological Bulletin* · July 2017

DOI: 10.1177/0038022917711739

CITATIONS

0

READS

1,989

1 author:



Gaurang Sahay

Tata Institute of Social Sciences

30 PUBLICATIONS 55 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Project

Globalisation and Tribal Movements [View project](#)

Life and Works of Dattatreya Narayan Dhanagare: An Introductory Account

Sociological Bulletin
66(2) 1–14
© 2017 Indian Sociological Society
SAGE Publications
sagepub.in/home.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0038022917711739
<http://journals.sagepub.com/home/sob>



Gaurang R. Sahay¹

Professor D.N. Dhanagare, a distinguished Indian sociologist, passed away at the age of 81 on 7 March 2017 following a brief illness due to cardiac and renal problems. With his passing away, we lost an erudite public intellectual, and a tradition of scholarship in sociology in India has come to an end. He leaves behind, among many other things, a great tradition of sociological research in the areas of peasant and farmer movements and agrarian relations, thought-provoking teaching and meticulous research supervision.

Dhanagare was a regular visitor in the Tata Institute of Social Sciences as an expert or teacher. He was invited to develop and teach a course 'Social Movement and Social Change' in Development Studies master programme. He taught the course for six years from 2008 to 2013. Since I was coordinating the programme, I used to meet him frequently. Our meeting turned into a fruitful academic relationship. He made me realise my many limitations, but encouraged me to read, write and publish. Personally, I have lost a mentor.

A Note on Academic Life

Born in 1936 in a village in Vidarbha region, Maharashtra, Dhanagare was a brilliant student who graduated from the Nagpur University with first position in MA examination in sociology in 1959. Immediately afterward, he joined S.S. College, Amaravati, as a lecturer to teach sociology in both Marathi and English languages. He shifted to the Institute of Social Sciences in Agra University as a faculty member in 1961. He developed a sustained academically fruitful relationship through his works and teachings with notable sociologists, such as R.N.

¹ Professor, Centre for Study of Developing Societies, School of Development Studies, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai, India.

Corresponding author:

Gaurang R. Sahay, Professor, Centre for Study of Developing Societies, School of Development Studies, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai 400088, India.
E-mail: gaurangsahay@gmail.com

Saxena, Brij Raj Chauhan, S.K. Srivastava, B.D. Soni and Yogesh Atal, who were his colleagues in the institute.

Dhanagare visited University of Massachusetts during 1965–1966 on a teaching assistantship. His stay in the University proved to be academically enriching. The papers that Dhanagare developed during his stay in the university were eventually published in research periodicals, such as *India Quarterly*, *Sociological Bulletin* and *Indian Psychological Review*. After coming back to India, Dhanagare prepared a paper on electoral violence during fourth general election in India in 1967 and presented it in the All India Sociological Conference which was subsequently published in the *Economic and Political Weekly*.

Dhanagare moved to the Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), Kanpur, in 1968 as a lecturer. IIT, Kanpur, granted leave to him to do PhD as a commonwealth fellow in the University of Sussex. Accordingly, he spent three years (1970–1973) in the University of Sussex as a research student. He acquired a lot of lessons by attending the seminar courses of Tom Bottomore, Zevedie Barbu and Berry William in the University of Sussex which helped him to select the issue of peasant movements in India for his PhD research work. He successfully completed his research work in 1973 under the supervision of Zevedie Barbu. His association with Sussex University offered him an opportunity to gain deeper insights into the sociological traditions that were rooted in history and philosophy on the one hand and permitted freedom of conceptual innovation on the other. The association brought about a major shift in his academic orientation from fieldwork-based research to research in historical sociology with a comparative perspective. His stay in Sussex not only earned him some life-long intellectual friends but also made him aware of the enormous scholarly material, manuscripts and documents.

Dhanagare's research work in the University of Sussex which was published initially in the form of papers in the journals, such as *Past and Present*, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, *Sociological Bulletin*, *South Asia* and *Australian Journal of Politics and History* elevated him to the position of Reader in IIT, Kanpur, and made him an expert on social movements/peasant movements, an emerging field of study in sociology in India. Dhanagare's thesis on peasant movements which was published as a book by Oxford University Press in 1983 proved to be a trend setter in sociology in India. Many universities introduced courses on social movements or peasant or agrarian movements. Dhanagare accepted an offer of Chair Professorship in the Department of Sociology from the University of Pune (now Savitribai Phule Pune University) in 1977 where he remained till retirement in 1995. He contributed a lot in making the department one of the best in the country.

Dhanagare had also remarkable administrative skills and was a great institution builder. As the vice-chancellor of Shivaji University, Kolhapur, Member Secretary of the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) and the President of the Indian Sociological Society, he contributed a lot to the betterment of these institutions and has left an inconceivable mark on these institutions. He did not succumb to political pressure and foul play in Shivaji University, Kolhapur, and retained the autonomy of the university. To him, institution building was equally important and challenging as research, teaching and supervision.

Dhanagare won several awards, such as Commonwealth Scholarship, I.C.H.R Fellowship, Visiting Asian Scholar at Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies, Copenhagen, Denmark, Foreign Studies fellowship from Tokyo University, Shastri Indo-Canadian Institute's Visiting Fellowship, National Fellow at Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla, UGC National Lecturer, and Visiting Research Professor. Dhanagare visited various academic institutions in different parts of the world as visiting professor or research fellow. He was a life member of the Indian Sociological Society, Indian Institute of Public Administration, Marathi Samajshastra Parishad, People's Union of Civil Liberties, Indian Association of Social Sciences and a member of International Sociological Association. He received Indian Sociological Society Life Time Achievement Award.

After coming back from the University of Sussex, he occupied the centre stage in sociology in India, though he never consciously courted popularity and refused to engage in politicking and networking. He did not take kindly to trendy but transient side-shows in the discipline. Steadfast in his convictions, he had the courage to swim against the tide. He always cherished academic integrity as a great value. He commanded a rare but remarkable reputation in academia. He was perhaps India's one of the best-known and most-admired social scientists because his prolific as well as profound writings were read widely all over the world and his sustained interest and intense engagement in building the community of sociologists. We encounter Dhanagare's students and admirers everywhere.

When Dhanagare started his career as a teacher in the early 1960s, Marxist social thought seldom received the attention it deserved in the mainstream of sociology in India. The climate was dominated by Parsonian functionalism all over which was reflected in village studies. He introduced courses mainly focusing on social movements, sociological theory and Indian sociology, and in teaching them he undogmatically presented alternative perspectives particularly Marxist perspective. He is among the earliest sociologists in India who introduced Marxist approach and class analysis of social structures and processes in India. The Marxist challenge to the structural-functional paradigm as it developed from the 1970s onwards would not have emerged powerfully in India in the absence of Dhanagare's sustained efforts and interests.

Professor Dhanagare's style of teaching had a distinctive mark of its own, being most self-effacing and yet assertive, clear, discursive and jargon-free to the core. He used to explain the matter with politeness. He liked to relate in his teachings abstract concepts in sociology to the everyday experience and institutional context of Indian society. His understanding and analysis was always backed by historical data, careful scrutiny of existing studies and observations based on fieldwork. Though, he was receptive to all social science approaches, his commitment to Marxism as an epistemology, social theory and political project never dithered. Because of his creative and thought provoking teachings, he was always revered in academic circles. Many of his graduate students fondly recall the way he shaped the careers of generations of sociologists. Several of these students later developed working relationship with him. Professor Dhanagare never failed in the role of a good teacher all his life. Many students and colleagues would miss him as a teacher of exceptional clarity, a scholar with remarkable intellectual integrity and as a person of rare warmth and affection.

In bringing Marxian social thought, both theoretical and substantive, into mainstream sociology in India in the 1970s onwards Dhanagare was actually swimming against the tide. However, he did so with a missionary zeal and without an iota of altruism. It must also be stressed that far from being doctrinaire, his Marxism was open, non-dogmatic and humane. This should explain why his works were highly rated and extensively cited even by non-Marxists. He always believed that Marxism as a social theory and analytical method had not only survived during the heyday of capitalism but will always survive. If Marxist sociology gained both respectability and legitimacy in India, it must be acknowledged that the credit should also be given in a major way to Dhanagare for his untiring efforts.

Whether sociology is purely an armchair analytical activity or is also a set of ideas whose ultimate validity must be established in praxis was a conundrum that occupied Dhanagare's sensitive mind almost throughout his years of professing sociology. In the class room and in seminars, he projected sociology primarily as a scientific discipline and analytical schema. But he gave an unequivocally clear indication that he was not hostile to political and activist engagement of a sociologist. On the contrary, he felt that radicalism in sociology was actually an extension of the enlightenment project where fusion of ideas and action become both feasible and purposeful in the sense that they enrich one another. On the question of separability of analysis from action, or otherwise, Dhanagare avoided taking any dogmatic position, although he became an involved observer, a participant analyst of some of the major farmer movements in India during his academic career. Being a champion of democracy and a voice of sanity in academia, he always advocated peace, social justice and the cause of the poor and marginalised sections. At the same time, he was critical of the right-wing economic liberalism that became prominent in India after the 1980s. As the President of the Indian Sociological Society, he provided an effective forum for dissent and critique. He was a public intellectual all his life.

Some Major Works: An Overview

Dhanagare is the author of several books and articles. The bibliography given below shows his extraordinary range. He maintained a steady flow of academic contributions even after retirement and published two new books around the age of 80. This is remarkable by any standard and can be a source of inspiration for scholars everywhere. Through his works, he made historical and comparative methods as important source of knowledge in sociology in India. His works are easily accessible, lucid and enlightening and contribute a lot to the advancement of sociology or social science in India particularly Marxist sociology. There are not many scholars who can match his range from the peasant movements to farmers' movements, from globalisation to state, democracy and civil society, from inequality to revolution, and from social policy concerns in Indian sociology to critique of sociology in India. If one considers together some of his studies of Indian society under different titles he covers a long span of time from 1921 Moplah rebellion to farmers' movements, globalisation and civil society in late 20th century. In his writings, he has demonstrated an astonishing range of infor-

mation, depth and imagination. Dhanagare's diverse works, which may be grouped in different ways, need to be closely examined. I find, in particular, some of his books very inspirational, books where Dhanagare deals with critically important issues with an open mind. I believe a short introductory commentary on these books is needed to communicate significance of these works.

Peasant Movements in India 1920–1950

The book covers five major peasant movements, Moplah, Bardoli, Oudh, Tebhaga and Telangana peasant movements, which occurred in India between 1920 and 1950. It reflects on the role of different agrarian classes in peasant movements using Marxist conceptual framework. It observes that India during this period of history witnessed a plethora of peasant organisations. These organisations drew their ideological orientation either from the Congress or from the left-wing political parties. It characterises the 1921 Moplah rebellion as an expression of long-standing agrarian discontent among tenants, labourers and agriculturalists, which was intensified by the religious and ethnic identity of the Moplahs, majority of them were Muslims (1983, p. 82). The rebellion, which was pre-political in nature and lacked systematic organisation, effective leadership and ideology, targeted the upper class peasants belonging to upper Hindu castes, such as Kshatriya, Nayar and Nambudari. By the end of December 1921, the rebellion was completely suppressed with killing of 2,337 Moplahs.

The Bardoli movement of 1928 was a movement of the class of rich and middle-class peasants (Patidar peasants) against the method of revenue assessment and revision. Patidar peasants made a tactical alliance with poor sections of peasantry, such as Dublas, Dharalas and other tribal groups. The movement was encouraged by Mahatma Gandhi or the Congress Party because it did not give rise to consciousness along class lines and did not disturb the traditional social structure. The Bardoli satyagraha succeeded politically by espousing the cause of the better-off sections of the Indian peasantry but it did not arouse class consciousness among poor peasants or did not transform economic relations between agrarian classes which remained substantially feudal in character. The Congress Party assumed the mask of working for the masses, but it actually worked for middle and rich peasants. The poor peasants were left estranged as usual (1983, p. 125).

The 1920–1922 peasant movement in Oudh was a spontaneous violent struggle by poor peasants due to a steep increase in prices of goods and rent and insecure rights in land by tenants. Spiralling price brought increased income to the rich and middle-class peasants, but it spelt deepening distress for the poor peasants who were unable to grow enough for subsistence. In 1930–1932, circumstances had changed. The agrarian distress during the depression was felt more by rich and middle strata of peasantry. Accordingly, they launched a movement under the leadership of the Congress Party. The Congress Party persuaded a sizeable poor tenants and landless labourers to participate in the 1930–1932, movement. However, when the prises recovered and stabilised, the rich and middle peasants gave up the struggle. In 1920–1922, the movement was local and religion was used to mobilise poor peasants at the grass roots. In 1930–1932, the Congress

Party mobilised peasantry without arousing political consciousness along class lines as a part of nation-wide struggle for freedom.

The All India Kisan Sabha, a farmer organisation affiliated to the Communist Party of India, staged two Left-wing peasant movements in India: the Tebhaga struggle in Bengal and Telengana revolt in Andhra. The Tebhaga movement in Bengal in 1946–1947 was a struggle by sharecroppers, who were mostly Muslims, tribals and Harijans, to retain a two-thirds share of the agricultural produce for themselves and thereby reduce the rent paid to *jotedars*—a class of rich farmers belonging mainly to upper Hindu castes—from one-half to one-third of their produce. The movement was led by educated people mostly from the urban middle class. It was the first consciously attempted revolt by a politicised peasantry in India. While the agrarian class structure, the social changes taking place until the mid-forties and the economic crisis following the war and famine were all conducive to such a resistance movement, without CPI and Kisan Sabha activity the Tebhaga movement would not have happened. The Tebhaga revolt never assumed a serious proportion. Communal politics, the general political developments in the country and the Bargadars Bill which proposed to provide the tenurial security with two-thirds crop-share to bargadars weakened the movement.

Telengana peasant revolt, which happened in the erstwhile Hyderabad state, was launched by the Communist party of India in the middle of 1946 and lasted till October 1951. Hyderabad state was a feudal or despotic state under the Nizams. There were two major agrarian classes: upper class consisting of landlords, Jagirdars, deshmukhs and sahukars and the lower class consisting of poor peasants, tenants, share-croppers and agricultural labourers. The communist organisations, such as the Kisan Sabha and Andhra Conference voiced the peasants' grievances and successfully launched a movement to abolish landlordism and *vetti* system, prevent rack-renting and eviction of tenants, reduce taxes, revenues and rents, and confirm occupancy rights of cultivating tenants. The CPI press launched a massive propaganda in favour of the movement. As the insurrection developed, the poor peasants and the landless labourers began to seize lands from landlords and deshmukhs and to occupy west lands which they distributed among themselves. This enlarged the scope of the movement but the leaders belonging to upper class and castes started deserting the movement. In 1948, the Nizam, the Muslim nobility, and also the Majalis-i-Ittehad organised a paramilitary voluntary force consisting of 100,000 razakars to fight against the peasant movement. But the movement remained strong and sustained. It is the merger of Hyderabad state into India in 1948 that led to the decline of Telengana movement. The Indian army suppressed the communist squads by killing over 2,000 peasants and party workers and by arresting 25,000 communists.

Populism and Power: Farmers' Movement in Western India, 1980–2014

This book has dealt with farmer movements in Maharashtra from early 1980s onwards. The book defines farmers as those cultivators who are, unlike peasants, not dependent on the landlords but on the market. It argues that when government

introduced Green Revolution, all stakeholders in agriculture were hoping to benefit from it because the stated target was all round development of rural India. It was believed that substantial growth in food production during 1970–1990 because of the Green Revolution would eventually generate employment and remove the spectre of poverty, hunger and malnutrition among the millions of the rural poor. However, the ensuing reality turned out to be contradictory. The Green revolution required large-scale capital investment which was beyond the reach and means of small and marginal farmers. Many of them tried to derive benefit from Green Revolution by taking resort to agricultural credit from both institutional and non-institutional sources. Consequently, they were caught into debt-trap. Besides, the great bulk of the subsidies and advantages vis-à-vis farm inputs, farm technology and institutional credit facilities were grabbed and monopolised by rich farmers using their political linkages, patronage and protection. Thus, only a minuscule minority class of rich farmers belonging to dominant castes became the principal beneficiary of Green Revolution.

The book argues that this model of rural development unleashed two different kinds of contradiction. First, as rich farmers were privatising the state resources and benefits of development, general socio-economic inequalities and poverty were on the increase in rural India. The second contradiction of the growth process was inherent in the insatiate greed of rich farmers to keep tight hold over all institutional opportunity structures which was bound to surface the moment rich farmers' interests came to clash with the interests of the urban industrial sector and market forces. The industrial capitalists wanted raw materials and food items supplied at the cheap rates to urban industries and consumers and farmers wanted reasonable remunerative prices for their produce. It is chiefly these two contradictions that explain the genesis of the farmers' movement in the 1980s in Maharashtra.

The book tries to understand the rise of Shetkari Sanghatana, a farmer organisation, and its principal ideologue, Sharad Joshi, in Maharashtra in the backdrop of these contradictions. Farmers of Maharashtra responded to the Sanghatana's first call to rasta-roko in the Chakan-Nashik area in support of demand for higher onion price in the summer of 1980. This agitation was soon followed by another mass protest in the form of rail and road block in Nasik region for remunerative prices for sugar cane. Just 6 months later, the Sanghatana launched its third major agitation, protesting against the exploitation of tobacco growers by blocking the Bombay-Bangalore National Highway. In 1982, the Sanghatana launched its agitation for fair milk prices against the government's milk pricing policy. The problem of remunerative prices for cotton and jowar was taken up the Shetkari Sanghatana in 1985 and 1986.

The book observes that Shetkari Sanghatana's ideology has always been populist because it sees peasantry as a single whole suffering or progressing together. The internal inequalities within the peasantry are pushed under the carpet. Sanghatana's populist ideology that derives justification from Rosa Luxemburg's thesis on capitalist development is tied to a kind of economism based on a dichotomy: Bharat versus India. Here, Bharat refers to rural agrarian society and India refers to urban industrial society. For Sanghatana, Bharat and India are two hard

contrasting realities. Sanghatana believes that the exploitation of Bharat by India or agriculture by the urban industrial sector in India has not been accidental at all, but it has been all along a logical consequence of a deliberate design and policy adopted by the government. The net result was continued to be impoverishment of Bharat and deterioration of the quality of life of the average farmers, while opulence was not only promised but also guaranteed to the industrial corporate sector.

Farmers' movements in Maharashtra have been a movement of a section of rich farmers which is not absorbed into the class structure of urban industrial India. Its main hostility is directed against the rural bourgeoisie which have joined hands with the industrial bourgeoisie and share with later its position. This explains why Sanghatana has been critical of cooperative institutions in general and the leadership of cooperative sugar factories in particular. This section of rich farmers does not want to be absorbed into India. The class wants opulence in rural areas to be ushered in through the economism of remunerative prices to the benefit of all sections of Bharat.

These movements had successfully drawn women in large numbers into their agitations right from the very beginning. The Sanghatana formed a women's front, namely, the Mahila Aghadi to mobilise women. The Sanghatana argued in favour of women's liberation and freedom from oppression but launched the Laxmi Mukti and Sita Sheti campaigns to preserve traditional values in the early 1990s. The Sanghatana, following its populist ideology, mobilised women as an undifferentiated category. By doing so, it tactfully evaded getting into caste or class differences among women farm workers. The farmers' movements in Maharashtra raised hopes among rural women, but ultimately, in so far as the issues of women's freedom, gender equality and justice are concerned, the hopes ended in despair.

The book also explores reasons leading to the decline of farmers' movements in Maharashtra. First, an unqualified and unbridled support to the GATT regime and economic reforms by Sharad Joshi led to divisions or fragmentation in the Inter-state Coordination Committee of farmers and in the Shetkari Sanghatana. Second, the establishment of Swatantra Bharat Paksha as an independent political party in 1994 by the Sanghatana alienated many farmers and lower level leaders from the movements because of their association with other political parties. Third, Joshi developed relationships with the political leaders without consulting trusted colleagues, leaders, activists and workers in the Sanghatana. Because of political association he was appointed as the chairman of the task force on agriculture by the NDA government. Before the NDA regime, Joshi was associated with V.P. Singh. Joshi's lust for power damaged the movement irreparably, and as a consequence, all ardent followers of Joshi started leaving the movement gradually. Fourth, the presence of political leaders with different ideologies in the Sanghatana meetings and the Sanghatana's frequent shifts in political alliances created confusion in the minds of farmers. Due to these factors, the Sanghatana's grip over the farmers' movements weakened leading to a drastic decline of the farmers' movement in Maharashtra. The inability of populist ideology to keep all the sections in peasantry united and to generate confidence among them during the times of crisis was fully exposed.

The book also consists of a paper on the farmer movement in Meerut, UP, by the Bhartiya Kisan Union (BKU) under M.S. Tikait's leadership. Most of the BKU's demands were the same as had been raised by other farmer organisation in other states in India, such as fair remunerative prices for sugarcane and reduction in electricity/canal water charges. The BKU proudly declared itself to be a purely non-political forum. Throughout the 25-day agitation in Meerut in 1988, the BKU's indifference and hostility towards the mainstream political parties was visible. Like in many other farmers' movements, rich farmers and the better-off peasants constitute main group who participated in the movement. The BKU also included other peasant classes, such as poor and middle peasants, in the movement using populist ideology. It was an apoliticist populist movement in which there was a growing disjunction between class and ideology. The fusion of inter-class subjects in the movement was achieved with an ever-increasing success by the populist ideology of the BKU. Tikait's adroit handling of primordial affinities of caste and khap reinforced the inter-class unity. Though the BKU mobilised farmers in large numbers but it withdrew agitation unconditionally without gaining much from the government.

The Writings of D.N. Dhanagare: The Missing Traditions

This book consists of papers on eleven important topics. It starts with a long insightful commentary on the nature of sociology in India. First, it observes that Indian sociologists run the risk of degenerating into 'academic narcissism', as they tend to advance their truth claims with complete indifference to truth claims of others. In doing so, they display an aversion to sustained involvement in dialogues, debates and discourse analysis. Second, there is an absence of true dialogues and debates in Indian sociology. So, discourses are neither initiated nor continued. Many themes that sociologists raise in their studies are not followed or continued. Finally, whatever meaningful discourses that have taken place have remained confined to the minuscule elite minority. So, the gap between elite and masses in Indian sociology is widening. The elites look down upon vernacular grassroots level practitioners of sociology in India.

There are three chapters that deal with the issues related with the globalisation. It argues that with growing economic integration at international level based on the activities of multinational corporations and dictated by the advanced industrial capitalist economies nation-states will be weakened or lose their status or autonomy. Transnational corporations (TNC) or multinationals accelerate the outflow of profits from the developing countries to developed countries. Thus, globalisation restores neo-colonialism. Its impact on developing societies and working class is alarmingly negative. The working class is practically pushed into the background and is likely to become invisible soon because of tertiarisation, feminisation, casualisation and precariation. Globalisation has led people in the developing world to reinvent and assert their identities and tradition which have led to enmity and conflict between communities. Fanaticism, fundamentalism and ethnic strife have been on the rise. There has been erosion of local cultures and promotion of global mega culture with disastrous consequences. This process is

also associated with displacement and acquisition of resources. For example, the builder lobby lure people from fringe areas to part with their land in return of assurance that their areas would be included in the metro limits so that those with assets will benefit from appreciation of values of their assets.

Two papers in the book examine the classical and contemporary conceptual debate on the relationship between civil society, state and democracy and discuss their nature and presence in India. They observe that the record of civil society and democracy has not been all that unimpressive despite all the challenges that emanate from criminalisation of politics, caste-based politics, political rumblings, insurgencies, secessionist and separatist movements, etc. However, the declining legitimacy of state, the debacle of formal institutions, growing intolerance, lack of communication, discussion and debates, and weakening capacity for conflict resolution in contemporary India are antithesis to democracy and civil society. Universities are visualised as a forum of civil society because they are an autonomous academic body which are crucial in inculcating the virtues of civil society.

The book talks about Green Revolution and social inequalities in India in the sixth chapter. It claims that Green Revolution made us believe initially that it would benefit small or medium farmers as much as larger farmers. However, it became quite clear sooner that the Green Revolution technology suits rich farmers much better than small and marginal farmers because the rich farmers alone have adequate resources to afford the expenses associated with Green Revolution technology. All available statistics indicate greater immiserisation and pauperisation of small and middle peasants with the spread of Green Revolution package. The Green Revolution technology has failed as a measure to alleviate poverty in the villages. This project has resulted into increasing inequalities in the already unequal rural society in India.

The chapter on revolution argues that there is a need to distinguish between the use of the term revolution as an ideal typical concept and its use as a metaphor. Many revolutions and the views of Indian sociologists have been discussed to highlight the distinction. It observes that the concept of revolution is important to understand complexity of human-lived experiences. Though there is a strong tendency to use the term revolution to those movements that succeed in overthrowing the existing power structure and take over power to reconstruct a society, its meaning cannot be consigned exclusively to objective observable criteria. Revolution may also lie somewhere between the observable reality and metaphor.

Three last chapters are about sociology in India. So far as the use of history in sociological studies in India, the studies by and large have chosen to estrange themselves from history. This tendency was quite rampant in the first phase of sociology in India. There is a need to rediscover the intrinsic value of history and historical method for sociology by creatively using it in researches and using it in pedagogic practices. Besides, the so-called schools in Indian sociology neither developed a distinct theoretical approach or perspective of its own nor were able to engage in paradigmatic research. They were isolated academic institutions without commanding followings in the domain of sociology. Social policy has not been a major concern in sociology in India. But there are sociologists who lobby vigorously with the government officials to bring to their notice the utility

of their research and their policy implications. They also involve themselves in evaluating existing social policies in order to contribute to effective governance.

Acknowledgements

I am very thankful to Bibhuti Mohanty for his great help in preparing the list of works by D.N. Dhanagare. I wish to thank Paramjit Judge and N. Jayaram for their insightful suggestions and my wife, Kumkum Prabhas, for her encouragement and invaluable help.

Writings of Dattatraya Narayan Dhanagare

Books

Dhanagare, D.N. (1975). *Agrarian movements and gandhian politics* (Extension Lecture Series 1). Agra, India: Institute of Social Sciences, Agra University.

——— (1982). *Rural transformation in India—Challenges and prospects*. Hukerikar Memorial Lecture Series 5. Dharwad, India: J.S.S. Institute of Economic Research.

——— (1983). *Peasant movements in India 1920–1950*. Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.

——— (1993). *Themes and perspectives in Indian sociology*. Jaipur, India: Rawat Publications.

——— (2001). *Joint forest management—A study of Uttar Pradesh*. Allahabad, India: G.B. Pant Social Science Institute.

——— (2014). *The writings of D.N. Dhanagare: The Missing Tradition*. New Delhi, India: Orient Blackswan.

——— (2016). *Populism and power: Farmers' movement in Western India, 1980–2014*. London, UK: Routledge.

Research and Review Articles in Journals and Edited Volumes

Dhanagare, D.N. (1963). On Sutherland's theory of differential association. *The Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2), 31–39.

——— (1964). Theoretical formulations in contemporary criminology. *Indian Journal of Social Research*, 5(2), 289–298.

——— (1967). Delinquency and opportunity theory in the context of justification. *Sociological Bulletin*, 16(2), 39–59.

——— (1967). Apartheid—Its theory and practice in South Africa. *India Quarterly—A Journal of International Relations*, 23(4), 338–361.

——— (1968). Violence in the fourth general elections—A study in political conflict. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 3(1&2), 151–156.

——— (1968). Perception of leader's competence and the rates of positive negative reactions in work-groups—A proposal for small group experiment. *Indian Psychological Review*, 4(2), 126–133.

——— (1968). Urban-rural differentials in election violence. *Political Science Review*, 7(3&4), 747–759.

——— (1968). Political elites and caste association—A critique. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 3(48), 1852.

Dhanagare, D.N. (1969). The problems of the visually handicapped and their rehabilitation. *The Social Science Review*, 11(1), 22–38.

——— (1969). Urbanism and crime. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 4(28–30), 1239–1242.

——— (1974). Social origins of the peasant insurrection in Telengana, 1946–1951. *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (New Series), 8, 109–34. Reprinted in A.R. Desai (Ed.). (1979). *Peasant Struggles in India* (pp. 486–516). Bombay, India: Oxford University Press.

——— (1975). The politics of survival, peasant organisations and the leftwing in India, 1925–46. *Sociological Bulletin*, 24(1), 29–54.

——— (1975). Congress and agrarian agitation in Oudh 1920–22 1930–32. *South Asia—Journal of South Asian Studies*, 5(1), 67–77.

——— (1976). Peasant, protest and politics: The Tebhaga movement in Bengal 1946–47. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 3(3), 360–378.

——— (1977). Agrarian conflict, religion and politics: The Moplah rebellions in Malabar in the Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries. *Past and Present*, 74(1), 112–141.

——— (1979). The end of the Congress hegemony: The sixth Lok Sabha elections in U.P., 1977. *Political Science Review*, 28(1), 28–51.

——— (1979). Prosperity and debt in rural Punjab. *Sociological Bulletin*, 28(1&2), 120–130.

——— (1980). Literacy and structural change in rural society in colonial India. *The Journal of Social Studies*, 7, 45–65.

Dhanagare, D.N., & Sharan, R. (1980). Trade unionism among the women workers of Kanpur. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 15(3), 447–458.

Dhanagare, D.N. (1980). Search for identity. *Seminar*, 254, 23–26.

——— (1980). Agrarian structure, social change and peasant revolts in India. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 17(1), 98–106.

——— (1980). Myth and reality in the Bardoli Satyagraha-1928: A study in Gandhian politics. *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 26(2), 265–278.

——— (1981). Interdisciplinary approach to social reality. *Journal of High Education*, 7(1), 97–109.

——— (1981). Violence and politics—A trend report. In ICSSR, *Political Dynamics Survey of Research in Political Science* (pp. 93–125) 3. New Delhi, India: Allied Publishers.

——— (1982). Rural transformation in India—Challenges and prospects. *Journal of the Institute of Economic Research*, 17(2), 1–33.

——— (1982–83). Urbanism and crime 1976–78. *International Journal of Critical Sociology*, 6, 14–22.

——— (1983). Rejoinder. *Sociological Bulletin*, 32(2), 240–244.

——— (1984). Equality in the Indian university. *Minerva—A Review of Science Learning and Policy*, 22(3–4), 388–403.

——— (1984). Agrarian reform and rural development in India—Some observations. *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change: A Research Manual*, 7, 177–201.

——— (1984). Prospects of an integrated approach to social reality. In R. Kumar (Ed.). *Philosophical theory and social reality* (pp. 168–183). New Delhi, India: Allied Publishers.

——— (1985). Sociology and social anthropology in India. In Yogesh Atal (Ed.). *Sociology and social anthropology in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 313–360). New Delhi, India: Wiley Eastern.

Dhanagare, D.N. (1985). Social tensions and protest movements in Maharashtra. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 20(24), 1030–1031.

—. (1985). Peasant movements in India, 1920–50. In H. Nakamura (Ed.). *Transformation and peasant movement in contemporary Asia* (pp. 5–31). Tokyo: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

—. (1985). Rural development, poverty and protest. *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (New Series), 19(2), 349–358.

—. (1986). Vidarbha's separate identity—Historical background. *State and Society*, 6(2), 16–29.

—. (1986). D.D. Kosambi: Dialectical materialism and the structure and dynamics of Indian society. *Sociological Bulletin*, 35(2), 33–54.

—. (1987). Green Revolution and social inequalities in rural India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 22(19–21), AN137–AN144.

—. (1988). Political economy of farmers' movements in India. *Prajnan-Journal of Social and Management Sciences*, 17(2), 245–251.

—. (1988). Nine theses on social movements—A critique. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 23(21), 1089–1092.

—. (1988). Action groups and social transformation in India. *Indian Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(4), 413–433.

—. (1988). An apolitician populism. *Seminar*, 352, 24–31.

—. (1988). Subaltern consciousness and populism—Two approaches in the study of social movements in India. *Social Scientist*, 16(11), 18–37.

—. (1990). Relevance of sociology—Some determinants. *Indian Journal of Social Work*, 51(1), 1–13.

—. (1990). Shetkari Sanghatana: The farmers' movement in Maharashtra—Background and ideology. *Social Action*, 40(4), 347–369.

—. (1992). Drought in Maharashtra—Misplaced priorities, mismanagement of water resources. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 27(27), 1421–1425.

—. (1992). Sustainable development, environment and social science research in India. *IFSSO—Bulletin of the International Federation of Social Science Organisations*, 27–28, 38–50.

—. (1993). Tradition and modernity as paradigms of social change—A critical overview. *The Loyola Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 18–35.

—. (1993). NGOs and foreign funding. *Man and Development*, 15(2), 133–146.

—. (1993). Remembering Tom Bottomore. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 28(48), 2581–2583.

—. (1993). Three constructs of Hinduism. *Seminar*, 411, 23–27.

—. (1994). The class character and politics of the farmers' movement in Maharashtra during the 1980s. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 21(3–4), 72–94.

—. (1997). Transnational corporations and their role in the Indian economy. In H. Yamaguchi et al. (Eds.). *Tradition and modernity* (pp. 163–182). New Delhi, India: Munshiram Manoharlal.

—. (1999). The new farmers' movement in Maharashtra and its response to new economic reforms. In F. Oshikawa (Ed.). *South Asia under the economic reforms* (pp. 247–261). Osaka, Japan: The Japan Centre for Area Studies.

—. (2000). Joint forest management in U.P.: People, panchayats and women. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 35(17), 3315–3324.

—. (2001). Towards an anthropology of nation-states. *Journal of Indian School of Political Economy*, 13(2), 367–372.

Dhanagare, D.N. (2001). Civil society, state and democracy: Contextualising a discourse. *Sociological Bulletin*, 50(2), 167–191.

_____. (2003). Globalisation—Towards an alternative view. *Sociological Bulletin*, 52(1), 4–31.

_____. (2004). Social policy concerns in Indian sociology. *Sociological Bulletin*, 53(1), 4–30.

_____. (2007). Practising sociology through history: The Indian experience – I. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(33), 3414–3421.

_____. (2007). Practising sociology through history: The Indian experience—II. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(34), 3499–3508.

_____. (2009). Social integration: Role of the state and civil society. In Muchkund Dubey and M.K. Jabbi (Eds). *A social charter for India—Citizens' perspective of basic rights* (pp. 160–170). New Delhi, India: Pearson.

_____. (2011). On encounter between urban fringe and neo-liberal capitalism. In J.K. Dikshit (Ed.). *The urban fringe of Indian cities* (pp. 24–31). Jaipur, India: Rawat Publication.

_____. (2011). Legacy and rigour: The Bombay school of sociology and its impact in universities in Maharashtra. In Sujata Patel (Ed.). *Doing sociology in India: Genealogies, locations and practices* (pp. 127–157). New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2013). Understanding the new farmers' movement in Maharashtra: Towards an analytical framework. *The Eastern Anthropologist*, 66(2–3), 163–217.

_____. (2014). Negative returns of ambivalence electoral politics of the farmers' movement, 1980–2014. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 49(49), 40–50.

_____. (2016). Declining credibility of the neoliberal state and agrarian crisis in India: Some observations. In B.B. Mohanty (Ed.). *Critical perspectives on agrarian transition: India in the global debate* (pp. 138–163). London: Routledge.